

THE  
COMMON SCHOOL JOURNAL.  
NEW SERIES.

WM. B. FOWLE, EDITOR.

VOL. XII. BOSTON, JULY 15, 1850. NO. 14.

THE GRADING OF SCHOOLS.

NO. II.

In our last number we endeavored to show that the grading of schools, or the separation of children into three or more classes, according to age or attainments, although considered a great improvement, and recommended by high authorities, is founded on a defect inherent in the system of instruction pursued, and we promised to describe a plan, which, in our opinion, if well executed, is more thorough, better adapted to general use, and at the same time less expensive.

The greatest difficulty experienced in our common schools is, the necessity of having so many classes, that the teacher must either omit hearing the recitation of some, or, as is more common, slight them all. A district school not unfrequently contains sixty or eighty pupils, of all ages and every degree of knowledge, from nothing upward, or, in some cases, from nothing *downward*. It is the object of the teacher to make as few classes as possible, and he generally makes the classes so large that children are brought together who are entirely unfit to learn the same lesson, and to work together. In this case, the more talented and the more industrious, are kept back by the dull and the indolent, and the latter are slighted or urged on beyond their strength and ability. Not one school in fifty can be classed so that justice can be done to every child. Here is the origin of the system of gradation of schools now under consideration. The older and brighter pupils are all put together to form a high school; the beginners form a primary

school, and all between them form the intermediate, or, as some call it, the grammar school. But this does not end or cure the evil. If the high school contains fifty or sixty scholars, they cannot all be in one class, and some division must be made. Sometimes the classification is based upon the time of entrance, those of each year forming a separate class, as is the case at college; but who does not see that this is no basis, unless the children are all equal in capacity, industry and attainments. In such schools, the same course of study, is pursued by the whole class, and as we said before, some have not enough to do, or others are overworked. If the classification is based on talents, there must be many classes, and of course, a continuance of the original difficulty. What we have said of the high school, is true of the intermediate and primary, the classes are large and unfit to work together; or numerous, and, of course, they can have but a small portion of the teacher's attention.

As to the saving of expense, this must arise from the employment of cheap teachers for the lower grades, that a larger salary may be paid to the teacher of the high school. The great injustice which is done to females by paying them less than is paid to males who may be their inferiors, induced the late Secretary to propose a male teacher for the high school, and females for the two others,—that is, where three males are employed in three district schools, at \$400 a year, his proposal is to employ three females at the common price of \$150 or \$200 each, and then give \$600 or \$750 to the male,—but it must not be supposed that the secretary ever approved of such injustice, and much less is it to be supposed that the injustice is never to be done away. As, however, nothing but injustice can make the grading system as cheap as that which generally prevails, it is not a safe basis of calculation, and is not in accordance with that comprehensive precept of Jesus, which requires us "To do unto others as we would wish them to do to us."

The system that we propose would need but one teacher for three district schools, or one for one hundred and fifty children of all ages and degrees of advancement, and it would require but one schoolhouse *instead* of three,—just such a one as the Secretary proposed to have *in addition* to the three. Of course, the number of teachers required would be greatly diminished, but many benefits would arise, and no harm be done by reducing the number. It is perfectly clear, that a very large number of the teachers now employed, are unfitted for the important and difficult work of educating and training the

mental, moral and physical powers of children; and, never intending to make teaching a permanent profession, they never will be fitted. It is as clear, that our normal schools and other manufactories of teachers will never supply any considerable number of such teachers as are needed to make the work of education effectual. Any system, therefore, which shall reduce the number one half or two thirds, will essentially benefit the community by employing only the best teachers, and by enabling them to labor and study and be liberally paid for exclusively devoting themselves to their profession. We speak what we do know, and we testify to what we have seen, when we make this assertion, and we think school committees, who have examined many teachers, will not require us to prove the declaration, and the teachers, if they know what vouchers are in our possession, will not ask us to exhibit them.

Instead, then, of supporting four schools, we would have but one, and instead of employing four teachers of small capacity, we would have but one, who should be a superior one. If the number of pupils should be two hundred or more, we should propose to separate the sexes, and have a school for each, a very desirable arrangement whenever it can be made, for females are better taught by females, and better taught apart, it being our settled opinion that, neither the course of instruction nor the discipline proper for boys, is proper also for the other sex. We may take this subject up hereafter, but now shall assume that the schools are to be mixed, and not to contain more than one hundred and fifty pupils.

But, how are we to instruct one hundred and fifty pupils, when, as we have allowed, the teachers in our district schools cannot teach one third of this number as they should be taught? We answer,—*By allowing, or rather requiring the teacher to employ his better pupils, as his assistants.* We know that this remark will excite a shrug in some, and a shudder in others, but we are ready to prove any thing we assert on this subject, by arguments or by facts, and in the pursuit of truth we have learned to disregard the shrugs of the self-conceited and the fears of the ignorant. We have much experience, many facts, in regard to the system, and no pecuniary interest to be affected by its adoption or rejection. We never heard an objection against it that was not refuted by our own experience, or proved to arise not from any fault in the system, but from mismanagement; and, if this is an objection to this system, it should at once lead to the rejection of the other, and even to

Christianity, which divine system, has been more mismanaged than any ever proposed for the improvement of mankind.

We base our views of the system we propose, first, upon the great principle that all teachers, if at all faithful, are learners; second, upon more than twenty years personal experience in the application of the system in large schools; third, upon successful experiments made in New England, and especially in Boston; fourth, upon authorities, foreign and domestic, of unquestionable character. In our next number, we shall say something upon each of these points, and give some more detailed information in regard to the plan we propose.

The Free Schools of New England are justly its glory and its strength, but, like all other institutions of long standing, they need reformation, and adaption to the present condition of society. All the measures now in progress for their improvement seem to be utterly insufficient and almost trifling; the axe will be laid at the root of the tree, if such improved shoots are not immediately grafted upon the good old stock as will not only quicken its growth, but improve its symmetry, and change the crab-apples into which it has degenerated, into golden pippins. We hope our subscribers will call the attention of teachers and school committees to our suggestions, and we invite our exchanges to republish what we may say upon this subject, a subject of vital concern to their subscribers as well as to ours.

---

### TEACHING THE BLIND.

Extract from an *Analytical Exposition of the Methods employed to instruct the Blind*. By DR. GUILLIE, *Director General of the Royal Institution of Blind Youth*, at Paris, 1817.

[Translated for the Journal.]

“At the commencement of our Institution, we confined ourselves to teaching the blind reading and writing, the French Grammar and Geography; the languages were not taught, for it was not thought possible to teach them. We began with studying Latin, but what a labyrinth, what an ocean to children deprived of sight, is the selection of words from a dictionary, which they can only use by means of another person. Yet they learned thus, aided by masters as inexperienced as themselves, to translate some elementary pieces; but they were soon brought to a stand, and we then learned that they could

not be taught like common children, and that the instruction must be proportioned to their infirmity. And here we were set up again by the discovery of the plan of mutual instruction, which they are pleased to call the system of Bell or Lancaster, although it belongs to neither of them, and came to us, it seems, from India.

This method, which is simple and natural, had always seemed to us the best, and we used it for a long time, when it was first publicly used. It has been demonstrated that it would be impossible to instruct the blind in numbers, to teach them anything whatsoever, but especially the languages, without the help of mutual instruction. Two male teachers and one female are sufficient to teach eighty pupils reading, writing, the French language, Latin, Greek, English, and Italian, geography, history, transcendental mathematics, and vocal and instrumental music in all its parts. So great a number of pupils instructed, and we dare to add, well instructed by three persons, may well be considered a eulogy on the plan of mutual instruction. We take the first boys, and six monitors taken from the most distinguished pupils, are employed to transmit our instruction to their comrades. From those instructed by these monitors the most advanced are selected for *repeaters*, and from those instructed by the repeaters, we select *weekers*, who, knowing too little to teach long, are only employed a *week* at a time. Thus from him who reads Tacitus to him who stammers the A. B. C., all are teachers, and all advance with giant steps towards the end which is constantly before them. This is, I think, the true mutual instruction, whatever name men may give to it."

---

[For the Journal.]

## MONSIEUR AND HIS ENGLISH MASTER.

### A DIALOGUE.

*Frenchman.* No sair, I nevair shall, can, will learn your vile langue. De verbs alone might, should, could, would put me to death.

*Master.* You must be patient. Our verb is very simple compared with yours.

*F.* Sample! vat you call sample? When I say *que je fusse* you say dat I might-could-would-should-have-been. Ma foi, ver sample dat! Now, sair, tell to me, if you please, what you call one verb?



*M.* A verb is a word that signifies to be, to do, or to suffer.

*F.* Eh bien! when I say, *I can't*, which I say, I be, I do, or I suffiare?

*M.* It may be hard to say in that particular case.

*F.* Ma foi, how I might-could-would-should am to know dat? But tell to me, if you please, what you mean when you say, "de verb is a word."

*M.* A means *one*, and it is the same as to say, the verb is *one* word.

*F.* Eh bien! Den when I me serve of I might-could-would-should-have-been-loved, I use one verb. Huh! (*with a shrug.*)

*M.* Yes, certainly.

*F.* And that verb is *one* word! I tinks him ver long word, wiz more joints dan de scorpion have in his tail.

*M.* But we do not use all the auxiliaries at once?

*F.* How many you use once?

*M.* One at a time. We say I *might-have-been-loved*, or I *could-have-been-loved*.

*F.* And dat is only one word! What you mean by *I could*.

*M.* *I was able.*

*F.* Ver well. What you mean by *have*?

*M.* *Hold, possess.* It is difficult to say what it means apart from the other words.

*F.* Why you use him den? But what you mean by *been*?

*M.* *Existed.* There is no exact synonyme.

*F.* Ver well! Den when I say, *I could-have-been-loved*, that wills to say, I was-able-hold-existed-loved, and dis is one word! De Frensh shild, no higher as dat (*holding his hand about as high as his knees,*) he might-could-would-should-count four word, widout de pronoun. Bah! I shall nevair learn de English verb, no, nevair, no time.

*M.* When you hear me use a verb, you must acquire the habit of conjugating it, just as, I love, thou lovest, he loves; and believe me, you *can't* become familiar with the modes and tenses in any other way.

*F.* Well, den, I shall, will, begin wiz *can't*. I can't, you can'test, he can'ts; we can't, ye or you can't, zey can't.

*M.* It is not so. *Can't* is a contraction of the verb *cannot*.

*F.* Well zhen. I cannot, zhou cannotest, he cannoteth or he cannots; we—

*M.* No, no! *Cannot* is two words, *can* and *not*.

*F.* Den what for you tie him togezzer?

*M.* I see I *ain't* careful enough in my expressions.

*F.* Stop! hold dere, if you please, I will-shall once more try. I ain't, zhou ain'test, he aints ; we——

*M.* *Ain't* is not a verb, it is only a corruption. I *won't* use it again.

*F.* Ma foi ! it is all one corruption. May or can I say, I won't, zhou won'test, he won'ts?

*M.* No, you can't say so.

*F.* What den? I might-could-would-should-don't-ain't-won't-can't?

*M.* No, you can't say any such thing, for these verbs are all irregulars, and *must* not be so used.

*F.* *Muss*, what you call *muss*? I muss, zhou mussest, he musses. You say so?

*M.* No, no, no.

*F.* Well den, I might-could-would-should-have-been-muss,—how dat?

*M.* *Must* is irregular. It never changes its termination.

*F.* Den what for, why you call him irregulaire, if he no shange? *Ma foi*, he will-shall-be ver regulaire, ver regulaire indeed. Who makes de grammaire English?

*M.* Nobody in particular.

*F.* So I tinks, I might-could-would-should-guess so. I will-shall-muss-can-understand nevair one grammaire, which say de verb be one word when he be four, five, six, half-dozen, and den call irregulaire de only uniform verb dat nevair shange. Scusey moi, Monsieur, I will-nevair-may-can-might-could-would-should study such horrible grammaire no more.

## WHICH IS THE BEST REFERENCE ENGLISH DICTIONARY FOR THE COMMON SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS?

The late resolve of the Legislature, giving a Dictionary to every Public School in the State, seems to give rise to the question which heads this article, and we shall endeavor to answer it. As the grant limits the choice to Worcester and Webster, the question is reduced to this: "Which Dictionary, that of Worcester or that of Noah Webster, is best for a reference dictionary to be used in our Common Schools?" After many years' use of *both* in a large school, where reading, spelling and pronunciation were more carefully attended to than is usual in this country, we unhesitatingly declare, that, in every respect, Worcester's is the preferable book, and it would be a

serious injury to the schools to admit Webster as a standard of spelling or pronunciation. Webster has many warm friends, and much of our sympathy is claimed, because "he is an American ; because his dictionary is more original than others, and is the result of thirty or more years of painful labor." The claim is natural, and the facts are true, but it does not follow that the Dictionary is the best *for our schools*. It was intended to be a learned and elaborate work, and this very circumstance, even if the labor were all well expended, and the learning all valuable and correct, would, in some measure, unfit the work for the use of the young. Children and teachers of our Common Schools, most of whom were very lately pupils in them, refer to a dictionary to find the meaning of words, their orthography, or their pronunciation. Webster rests his claims to superiority chiefly upon his etymological knowledge, and the fullness of his definitions. If we thought it necessary, we could show by the testimony of some of the best scholars, and greatest linguists, who were contemporary with Dr. Webster, or who have since gone over a wider course of study, that he is a very unsafe etymologist, his knowledge of other languages being that of the vocabulary or dictionary, and little more. But it is not necessary to enlarge on this point ; we are willing to concede what cannot be proved, because we conceive, that just so far as Dr. Webster attempts to be *recherche* in this respect, he goes beyond the wants of the schools. But it must not be forgotten that Mr. Worcester is as true an American as ever Dr. Webster was, and with a diligence not inferior to that of Dr. Webster, has also devoted a large portion of his life to lexicography. It was he who edited Todd's Johnson with Walker's Pronunciation, which superseded all other dictionaries in this country, more than twenty years ago, before Webster's dictionary appeared. Then, when it was proposed to abridge the great dictionary of Webster into one volume of a moderate size, the man selected by Webster himself to do this, was Mr. Worcester, and Dr. Webster pronounced the work well done. What there was valuable, and also what there was objectionable in Webster, must have been known to Mr. Worcester. Mr. Worcester then made a small dictionary for schools, which has had an unexampled run in this country, and is more used in this State, than all others united, and, finally, after many years of hard labor, he produced the dictionary which the Legislature now offers to the schools.

As to Webster's claim of superiority in the *definitions*, we think it will be found on examination that this matter is over-



rated. It is true, undoubtedly, that Dr. Webster's definitions occupy more space, but it will admit of question, whether they embrace more truth. One thing is very certain, that Dr. Webster's composition is often faulty, and a grammarian in search of false grammar, awkward sentences and diffuse style, would find good picking in the writings, and even in the grammars of Noah Webster.

As to the claim of originality, we doubt whether it is considered of much value even by Dr. Webster's warmest friends. It is true that he set out with some notions at variance with the usage of good writers and approved scholars, but it is also true, that many of these peculiar notions were abandoned by himself, in his life-time ; and many others, that he most cherished, have been abandoned by those who have the keeping of his reputation, the chief recommendation of the posthumous edition of the dictionary, that is now offered by the Legislature to the districts, being the fact, that nearly all Dr. Webster's peculiar notions have been rejected. It was so with Webster's grammar, that of 1785 being very different from those of later date, but Webster declared himself satisfied, in the former as in the latter case, that no improvement could be made ! We think it would not be difficult to show that the latter grammar contradicts the former, and that neither has any claim to originality. Worcester's definitions are less diffuse than Dr. Webster's, and the vocabulary is more extensive, though the book is not so bulky, and may not have been submitted to the critical examination of Queen Victoria.

We have said that the child consults a dictionary to settle the *orthography* of words. Now it is well known, that Dr. Webster, relying upon his own opinion of his ability to reform the language, and his supposed influence in the republic of letters, attempted to change the established authority, and to substitute changes of his own. Much credit has been given to him for dropping the final *k* in such words as *publick*, and for omitting the *u* in such words as *honour*. Now the fact is, that neither of these alterations originated with Webster, and if they had done so, they would have formed no ground for self-complacency ; for, as the sound of *k* is retained in the word *public*, and *c* is, at best, a useless and ambiguous letter, the *c* and not the *k* would have been dismissed by a judicious reformer ; and as the *o* in *honor* retains one sound of *u*, how plainly was it the duty of a reformer to omit the *o* and keep the *u*. But Dr. Webster attempted many other reforms, which were so generally disapproved that they never were adopted even by his friends. Many of them were discarded by himself, and

probably all would have been dismissed by his editors, had not they feared that the liberties they had already taken were enough to trouble the repose of the departed lexicographer. Several, therefore, of the departures from established orthography, proposed by Dr. Webster, are still retained in his dictionary, and they are entirely opposed to the usage of the best writers, teachers, schools, school-books, and presses of Massachusetts. The children and adults of this State have very generally been educated on a different model, and those corners of the State where Webster's spelling book and dictionary have been most used, are generally those which stand lowest in the Graduated Table, which accompanies the printed Abstracts of Returns, and are, of course, not distinguished for their liberal support of public schools. Webster's spelling book, has always been poorly printed and sold lower than any other, and hence, its immense circulation, of which so much is said.

Finally, the child looks into the dictionary to ascertain that pronunciation of words, which prevails in the best society, but he finds only that of Dr. Webster. It is true that the editors of the posthumous edition, in spite of Dr. Webster, and in deference to Worcester, have occasionally inserted the true, as well as the false pronunciation; but, after all, the dictionary is very deficient in this respect, and as far as our observation has gone, and it has been by no means limited, we have found that where Webster's dictionary alone has been used by teachers, pupils, or public speakers, very little attention has been paid to the matter of pronunciation, and in most cases it is decidedly behind the times. Worcester, like Webster, declares what he considers to be the true pronunciation of every word, but, unlike Dr. Webster, he gives all the authorities in regard to disputed words, and thus enables inquirers to judge for themselves, without expecting them to bow submissively to his dictation.

We sincerely hope, therefore, that the committees, with whom the choice lies between the two dictionaries, will not sacrifice the true interest of the schools by taking Webster's, merely because it costs twice as much as the other. Were the difference the other way; were Worcester's twice the price of Webster's, we should implore them to secure it by all means; but, when it is the cheapest as well as the best, we cannot but hope that the State will be put to as little expense as possible. We do not doubt the good faith of those who proposed to give a four dollar book or a two dollar book, at the option of the recipient; but it would have looked less like a trick of trade, if those who preferred Worcester at two dollars, had been allowed to take some other book also to the amount of four. The

books are placed upon an unfair basis, and we hope the committees will not be led astray by the Legislature. Worcester's smaller dictionary, or others at variance with Webster's, are very generally used in the schools of Massachusetts, and the spelling books in use are generally opposed to Webster's peculiarities. To make Webster the authority, under such circumstances, is to waste time and introduce confusion. Considering all the circumstances of the case, therefore, we feel bound to raise our feeble voice, as we now do, without any personal acquaintance with either author, and without any hope of reward, except that which we shall derive from the recollection of a well-meant endeavor to prevent a serious mischief to the schools of our beloved State.

No one would be more ready than ourselves for a thorough reform of English orthography, but we cannot see any benefit arising from such a partial reform as Dr. Webster proposed. He does not touch one in a hundred of our anomalies, and when he proposes to change the spelling of a class of words, he allows some words of the class to remain unchanged. The following illustration of Webster's orthography, as corrected, amended and authorized by his heirs, in the dictionary now presented for the acceptance of school committees, is taken from that judicious paper the Boston Mercantile Journal, and such an exhibition will do more than any argument with an intelligent school committee.

"The English language might be greatly improved were there any *center* around which the people could rally, or had we a few men of sufficient *caliber* to compel the mass to imitate them. Unluckily, few scholars have reached a *height* sufficiently elevated to command attention, or, having reached it, they have become the most rigid conservatives. The *sombre specter* of injured usage seems to rise and warn them not to attempt to *remold* what time has *modeled*, and covered with venerable *oxyd*. Were all the anomalies of our *unequaled* orthography collected in one head, so that one stroke of a *saber* could sever them all, and send them to repose forever in the *sepulcher* of awkward and perhaps useless things, one would be *marvelously willfull* not to be ready to strain every *fiber* to make the stroke effectual; but it is trifling to kill a snake joint by joint, *verteber* by *verteber*, as Dr. Webster proposes. It is to be regretted that the noble writers who perfected our language, and have rarely been *equaled* by the best of their successors, did not lay down rules for the reduction of all anomalous words to a uniform rule, as they might have done, had they been *thoughtfull*; whereas, they only fixed irregular-

ity, and by the *luster* of their talents, brought on a *thrall*dom, the end of which no earthly *traveler* can *foretell*. I am not a *worshiper* of antiquity, but I can not lay aside habits as easily as a bird *molls* its feathers. It is an *offense* to me to see old usages set aside or *canceled* under *pretense* of reform, when the reform, if it be one, is too partial to do any good. The *theater* of a man's actions may be very circumscribed, but the humblest can *practice* what is just, in language, as well as in conduct, and be a *counselor* and a *defense* to the weak and erring. To *fulfill* our duty, we should endeavor to *instill* into other minds, and exhibit in our own, a love of truth and simplicity, for as *niter* is powerless until mixed with carbon, so virtue is useless until by blending with society it finds objects, is tried, and becomes invigorated."

---

#### WILSON'S TREATISE ON ENGLISH PUNCTUATION.

Our educational library has lately been enriched by a copy of the little work, whose title is at the head of this article. We have read it through with great pleasure, and find little or nothing in it opposed to our own notions, but much that will be useful to us and to every teacher and author. In a sensible introduction, the author, who is a practical printer, and a very good one too, in Boston, very justly complains of the prevailing inattention to punctuation, even by teachers and popular authors, who generally depend upon their printers for the proper punctuation of their works.

Mr. Wilson judiciously remarks, that "Punctuation is founded rather on grammar than on rhetoric; that its chief aim is to unfold the meaning of sentences, with the least trouble to the reader; and that it aids to the delivery, only in so far as it tends to bring out the sense of the writer to the best advantage." In accordance with this definition, he calls the comma, semicolon, colon and period *grammatical* points; the notes of interrogation and exclamation, the parenthesis and the dash, *grammatical and rhetorical* points; the apostrophe, hyphen and quotation marks, *letter, syllabic* and *quotation* points; and among the *miscellaneous* marks, he places the brackets or crotchets, the inverted comma, the two commas, index, three stars, caret, brace, ellipsis, leaders, accents, paragraph, and references. We should not have divided the marks exactly so, for we should have put the quotation points in the miscella-



neous class, and the apostrophe, hyphen, accents and diæresis we should have called *verbal* points, but this is a small matter and does not affect the use of them. We should also, consider the medical, astronomical and arithmetical signs as out of place in a work on English Punctuation, for they are neither rhetorical nor grammatical, and belong to the language of science rather than to English; but this is no obstacle to the great utility and real merit of the Treatise. Every point or mark is defined, and has examples of its proper use, and then sentences for exercise, oral and written. The definitions are generally clear and simple, and the exercises such as are appropriate and sufficient; any one of ordinary intelligence can understand them, and there is no danger of mistaking exceptions for regulars, in another system we could name, if we wished again to get into hot water.

Besides valuable instruction in regard to punctuation, there is much other matter, which none but a practised proof reader could give, and we are induced to give one extract of this description, to show the character and value of the book, and to induce teachers, authors and students to purchase and study the work, and lay its instructions to heart. The punctuation of the extract is that of the author.

"We will suppose that the writer of a work, instead of transcribing it as many times as would be requisite for the perusal of his friends or his fellow-men, is desirous of saving himself this trouble, and of having a large number of copies put into their hands by infinitely more rapid means. With this design, he employs a letter-press printer, giving him such directions as he thinks are necessary. The manuscript, or "copy," is then delivered to the compositor, whose province it is to put in type what the author has written. As soon as the workman has finished the setting up of some eight, twelve, or more pages, according to the size of the paper to be used, and has arranged them in such a manner that they may all be printed together, he obtains a "proof," or impression in ink, of the matter he has set up; and then lays it, along with the copy, on the corrector's desk.

The proof-reader proceeds to the labor of correcting the press on the principle by which he should be actuated,—that of endeavoring to render the work of the compositor, where changes are necessary, as neat, accurate, and consistent in its parts, as possible. He begins by writing the phrase "First Proof" on the upper margin of the first page. He then examines the folios\* and the signatures,† the captions and the sub-heads;

---

\*Pages. † Letters or figures that mark the foldings of the sheet, to assist



notices whether the pages are of equal or proper lengths, and if the lines are straight or crooked; inspects the spacing or blank between the words and lines, that they may have regularity of appearance; and peruses the whole sheet more or less rapidly,—putting the corrections in the margin, as exemplified in the lithographic plate at the end of the present work.\* All this should be the first thing done in proof-reading; but, from a supposed want of time, it is commonly left undone, except so far as the duty can be performed in the next process, about to be described.

The manuscript is now put into the hands of an intelligent boy, who is able to read it aloud clearly and accurately. The corrector of the press has the proof-sheet before him, and, if he have gone through the process just mentioned, has seldom occasion, when making fresh marks, to stop the reader of the copy, unless there be some peculiar difficulty. His chief aim is to make the print an accurate representation of the author's writing, or mode of expression: but his attention is also devoted to the spelling of the words, in accordance with some authorized standard; and to the punctuation, that it may develop the construction of the sentences, and the meaning intended. He is not usually expected, nor indeed is it his province, to change the ideas to improve the style, or, except merely in a lapse of the pen, to correct grammatical blunders. But should any obscurities occur in the writing, or any errors or inelegances in the language, he may put a "query" (*Qy.*) in the margin, and leave the suggestions to be made in the next proof.

He then cuts off the unset portion of the last page of the manuscript in his hands, which with the proof-sheet he returns without delay to the compositor, whose business it is to make his work correspond in accuracy with the corrections marked. Having performed this duty, the compositor has another impression taken of his pages, which he delivers, along with the former one, to the proof-reader.

And now begins another process on the part of the corrector of the press, by his writing on the newly printed sheet the words "Second Proof." After placing the two proofs in juxtaposition, he minutely compares them, in order to ascertain whether all the errors that have been marked have been cor-

---

the binder. These are at the bottom of certain pages. Each new figure marks a half sheet, each figure with a star, marks what is called the inset of the half sheet.—[Ed.]

\* This very curious and useful plate is described in another paragraph of this extract.—[Ed.]

rected in the type; re-marking those which may have been neglected, transcribing the *queries* from the first proof, and making such suggestions as he thinks proper. Should the establishment have another proof-reader, he transfers to him the second proof, with the manuscript, to be examined again, and, if necessary, re-corrected. If, however, there is only one reader, he should with unwearied eye peruse it afresh; mark in the margin whatever errors may have escaped his notice in the previous reading, or been made by the compositor in the transference of the corrections; and, unless these be numerous, and therefore, demanding additional labor and a third proof, send the present one immediately to the writer of the work.

If the author be a thoughtful man, he will take care that no unnecessary delay occur in the performance of his duty; for, though it may possibly be a matter of little importance to the public or himself, when his book will make its appearance, it is of the utmost moment to the printer and his workmen that their materials be not blocked up, and their time not frittered away. He, therefore, proceeds at once to the inspection of his proof-sheet; to the task of examining every page, line, word, letter, with a keen and scrutinizing eye. In this he has in view one at least of two objects,—to ascertain whether the compositor and the proof-reader have left any errors uncorrected, or whether he himself, in the preparation of his manuscript, has been sufficiently careful to express his ideas in the clearest and most accurate manner. Indeed, to ensure the highest degree of correctness, he should have both objects in view; for even if the writer have genius, and the printer talent and taste, it is not to be supposed, that these qualities, so desirable in authorship and typography, will have made either of them immaculate. It is therefore probable that both parties have more or less erred. The spelling or the punctuation may perhaps be sometimes erroneous; the capitalizing and italicizing may be susceptible of improvement; inelegances may be noticed, improprieties perceived, grammatical inaccuracies detected, which, either in the warmth of composition or in a premature haste for going to press, were before concealed.

But an author may be capable of rectifying all these mistakes, and yet, from his inexperience or his carelessness, he may note them down in the proof-sheet in such a way as to make them either invisible or illegible, and thus defeat his own purposes. To prevent this result, he should mark his corrections, not with a pencil, but with a pen; and place them, not between the printed lines, but in the margin, exactly opposite where the changes required are to be made. In short, to

preclude the probability of additional or different mistakes, it should be his aim to use the very marks which the printer employs, and in a similar way. To facilitate an object so essential, we have drawn up two pages (*see plate at end*); the one exhibiting a proof-page, when read and marked, of work such as may proceed from the hands of a compositor; the other, as it would appear after the corrections have been duly made in type. The former is called a "dirty proof," because it contains a far greater number of mistakes than could be made by a skilful and attentive workman; but it is so presented that an author may see at once the whole of the marks which are adopted, and be enabled to write in the same manner those required in his own proof.

We may add, for the information of young writers, and to deter them from making changes out of mere caprice, that the transferring of these to type is a matter of considerable labor; and that alterations, when numerous, will form rather a heavy item in the printer's bill. To save, however, as much of this expense as possible, an author may, by a little manœuvring, often substitute, in room of what he erases, just as much as would fill up the space, expunge as great a proportion of matter as he wishes to introduce.

Having finished the reading and correcting of his proof-sheet, the author should write on the lower margin of the last page, either the word "Revise," indicating that he must have another proof, in order to compare it with the former, and to see whether all the pages are correct, before being printed; or the term "Press," showing that, after the alterations have been made in the metal, and read again by the office proof-reader, from a *third* impression, there will be no occasion for himself to see another proof, but that the *form* of pages may be put to press. The third proof is usually termed a "Revise," and so marked at the top of the first page.

When the form has gone to press, the first fair-printed sheet is shown to the proof-reader, who compares it with the revise, and cursorily examines the head and foot-lines, and the sides of the pages, to ascertain whether any types have fallen out or been broken, or any "bites" been made in the last processes.

---

✍ *All Communications, Newspapers, and Periodicals, for the Journal, should be addressed to Wm. B. Fowle, Editor, West Newton.*

---

Published and printed by FITZ, HOBBS & CO., 120 Washington street, to whom all remittances and letters of business should be directed, *post paid*.